



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/368,354      | 08/05/1999  | ROBERT R. BUCKLEY    | 103044              | 5438             |

7590                  06/17/2002

OLIFF & BERRIDGE PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

[REDACTED]  
EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MADELEINE ANH VINH

[REDACTED]  
ART UNIT                  PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                          |                        |                     |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                          | 09/368,354             | BUCKLEY ET AL.      |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                          | Madeleine AV Nguyen    | 2622                |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Madeleine AV Nguyen. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 (2) George Simion (Reg. No. 47,089). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 June 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shaughnessy et al (US Patent No. 5,075,787).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: we discuss the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required